

semiconductor device wherein the wiring is formed of a tungsten film and wherein an amount of sodium contained within the wiring is 0.3 ppm or less. The Examiner admits that this last feature of Claim 26 is not disclosed in Matsuda. The Examiner, however, contends that Oikawa discloses this feature at col. 6, lns. 16-26 and col. 8, lns 6-13 of Oikawa.

Applicants respectfully disagree. Claim 26 clearly recites an amount of sodium within the wiring. In contrast, Col. 6, lns. 16-26 and col. 8, lns. 6-16 in Oikawa are directed to sodium concentration in the target. The sodium concentration in the target is not the same as sodium concentration in the wiring. For example, the specification for the present application recites a target purity (see e.g. [0065] in the substitute-specification; [0033] in translation) and a sodium concentration for a wiring (see e.g. [0069] in substitute-specification; [0037] in translation) in a different manner and place. Hence, they are not the same, and the disclosure in Oikawa cannot be used to allege a teaching of an amount of sodium within the wiring. Therefore, Oikawa does not disclose or suggest of the claimed feature of Claim 26 of wherein an amount of sodium contained within the wiring is 0.3 ppm or less.

Independent Claim 31 includes the feature of wherein an amount of sodium contained within the gate electrode is 0.3 ppm or less. For similar reasons as discussed above for Claim 26, Claim 31 is also not disclosed or suggested by Oikawa.

Accordingly, the cited references fail to disclose or suggest the method of Claims 26-28, 30, 31 and 35, and the claims are patentable thereover. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 29-30 and 32-35

The Examiner also rejects Claims 29-30 and 32-35 under 35 USC §103(a) as being

unpatentable over Matsuda in view of Oikawa and further in view of Brodsky et al. (US 6,245,668).

This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

These claims are dependent claims. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above for independent Claims 26 and 31, these claims are also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 36 and 41

The Examiner also rejects Claims 36 and 41 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuda in view of Oikawa or Ikeda and further in view of Kobeda et al. (US 5,208,170). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

As explained above, the cited references do not disclose or suggest the claimed feature of wherein an amount of sodium contained within the tungsten wiring is 0.3 ppm or less, as recited in independent Claim 36, nor the feature of Claim 41 of wherein an amount of sodium contained within the gate electrode is 0.3 ppm or less. Hence, these claims are patentable over the cited references. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 37-40 and 42-45

The Examiner also rejects Claims 37-40 and 42-45 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuda in view of Oikawa or Ikeda, and Koeda and further in view of Brodsky. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

These claims are dependent claims. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above for the independent claims, these claims are also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Accordingly, for at least the above-stated reasons, the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any fee is due for this response, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark J. Murphy
Registration No. 34,225

COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO,
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, Ltd.
200 West Adams Street, Suite 2850
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 236-8500

Customer no. 000026568